

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 26th, 2006 has been received and reviewed. By the present Response and Amendment, Claims 1-14 are pending, Claims 1, 4, 8
5 and 9 are amended and Claims 2, 3, 7 and 14 are cancelled. No new matter is introduced.

Specification

10 The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of the following informalities:
(a) PTSN is used as an acronym for Public Switch Telephone Network;
(b) Applicant included references in the body of the specification; and,
(c) PC and PCS Acronyms were not fully described before first being used.

15 With respect to (a), Applicant's Amendments to the Specification submitted on 10/3/2003 includes the appropriate changes to the acronym for the Public Switch Telephone Network.

With respect to both (b) and (c), Applicant is submitting Amendments to the Specification with this office action to overcome the objections.

20 Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

25 Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for lack of antecedent basis. Applicant has amended the language in Claim 4 to overcome this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The date a patent is available as a reference is generally the date that the patent becomes enforceable. MPEP § 2126.01 and *In re Monks*, 588 F.2d 308 (1978).

5 Applicant submits that the following patents cited by Examiner are not available as references because the present Application perfected an earlier priority date as a Continuation-in-Part of 09/273,482, filed 03-22-1999:

10 WO Patent No. 99/53437 A1 to Shobara et al., filed 04-12-1999;
U.S. Patent No. 6,917,646 B2 to Chianale, filed 05-22-2001; and
U.S. Patent No. 6,724,403 B1 to Santoro et al., filed 10-30-2000;

15 Claims 1, 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,684,084 to Phillips and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,778,519 to Harrell et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,646,635 to Cockson et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

20 Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to implement the protective cap and swivel joint features of the antenna disclosed in Cockson with the system in Phillips. Neither Phillips, Harrel nor Cockson teach, disclose or suggest a modem comprising an antenna to receive transmissions and at least three tuner cards for providing a multi-task video screen split into a plurality of frames for specific functional operations. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to further clarify this distinction. In undertaking a determination of whether a reference, or a combination of references, renders a claim(s) obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the
25 examiner must show that the reference or combination teaches or suggests every element of the claim(s) in question. MPEP § 706.02(i). Because the combination of references does not teach at least three tuner cards providing for a video split, they cannot render Claim 1 obvious.

With respect to the subject matter claimed in Cancelled Claim 7 and Amended into Claim 1, Examiner argued that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to implement the video processor of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,062 to Hall to provide access to a plurality of data from multiple sources. Applicant claims that the PC/PCS *modem* in the present invention comprises the *tuner cards*, the purpose of which is to provide a multi-task video screen split into a plurality of frames of equal dimension. Hall alternatively discloses an apparatus that combines video streams to reduce interconnections between display devices (col. 2, lines 50-54 and 62-66). Hall teaches combining display devices by means of a *video processor* (col. 3, lines 6-10). Harrell teaches linking a plurality of peripherals by means of a *PC interface* (col. 2, lines 27-31). Neither Phillips, Harrell, Cockson nor Hall disclose *tuner cards* as means to combine video streams. Nor do any of the prior art references suggest including tuner cards in the *modem*. The prior art references cannot be combined to suggest that tuner cards included in the modem is well known to one with ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to Claim 3, it has been cancelled.

With respect to Claim 4, Examiner further argues that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to use a microphone as an audio input device and a loudspeaker as an audio output device. Neither Phillips nor Harrell disclose, teach or suggest coupling the loudspeaker and microphone to a microprocessor via an audio interface block. Rather, Phillips teaches that a separate audio jack (not shown) in the adaptor (reference 56) may provide audio input and output to and from the radiotelephone card (reference 12). Alternatively, Harrell teaches a computing system having one transceiver (reference 32) interfaced to the computing device and other transceivers interfaced to the peripheral devices. Therefore, neither of the prior art references can be combined to teach the coupling feature claimed in the present invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips in view of Harrel et al. and Cockson et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,876,737 to Woodworth et al.

Claim 2 is cancelled. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

5

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips in view of Harrell and Cockson and further in view of WO Foreign Patent 9953437A1 to Shobara et al.

With respect to Claim 5, Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to implement the front lock engagement piece of Shobara to engage a PCMCIA card into a locked state; however, Shobara is not available as a reference because the present Application perfected an earlier priority date as a Continuation-in-Part. A foreign patent, the contents of its application, or segments or its content should not be cited as a reference until its date of patenting or publication.

10
15 MPEP § 901.05. The date Shobara was made available to the public was 10-21-1999. MPEP § 901.05(b).

Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to implement a plurality of connectors on a PCMCIA card to receive a plurality of pins. Claim 6 in the present invention is directed to the arrangement of electrical conductors. Phillips discloses that the PCMCIA interface has a plurality of pins configured to receive the corresponding plurality of sockets on the radiotelephone card (col. 3, lines 42-49). The combined prior art references do not suggest, teach or disclose on the arrangement of conductors.

20
25 Additionally, because dependent Claim 6 incorporates the limitations of the claims on which it depends, it is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for the corresponding Independent Claims. Thus, as Claims 1 is allowable, Claim 6 is also allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips in view of Harrell and Cockson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,062 to Hall et al.

Claim 7 is presently cancelled.

5 With respect to Claim 9, because Claim 9 incorporates the limitations of the claim on which it depends, this dependent claim is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for the corresponding independent claim. Thus, as Claims 1 is allowable, Claim 9 is also allowable. Applicant submits that this rejection is overcome and respectfully requests the rejection is withdrawn.

10 With respect to Claim 10, Examiner argued that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to implement a video processor of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,062 to Hall to provide access to a plurality of data from multiple sources. Applicant claims that the PC/PCS *modem* in the present invention *comprises* the *tuner cards*, the purpose of which is to provide a multi-task video screen split into a plurality of
15 frames of equal dimension. Hall alternatively discloses an apparatus that combines video streams to reduce interconnections between display devices (col. 2, lines 50-54 and 62-66). Hall teaches combining display devices by *means of a video processor* (col. 3, lines 6-10). Harrell teaches linking a plurality of peripherals by *means of a PC interface* (col. 2, lines 27-31). Neither Phillips, Harrell, Cockson nor Hall disclose *tuner cards* as means to combine video streams. Nor do any of the prior art references suggest including tuner cards *in the modem*. The prior art references cannot be
20 combined to suggest that tuner cards included in the modem is well known to one with ordinary skill in the art.

25 Claims 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips in view of Harrell, Cockson and Hall and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,724,403 B1 to Santoro et al.

Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the

art to implement the feature of tuner cards as a means to view transmitted data in a compact manner. Neither Phillips, Harrell nor Cockson disclose tuner cards as a means to multi-task a video screen split into nine frames. Santoro discloses a graphical user interface program that presents information on to a display; however, Santoro is not available as a reference because the present Application perfected an earlier priority date as a Continuation-in-Part.

Applicant submits that this rejection is overcome and respectfully requests the rejection is withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,876,737 to Woodworth et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,428,671 to Dykes et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,917,646 to Chianale et al.

Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include the standard connections, the line amplifiers and the switches taught in Dykes and Chianale as means for communicating wireless signals to a modem. Chianale teaches the implementation of a switch in conjunction with the modem and the line amplifiers; however, Chianale is not available as a reference because the present Application perfected an earlier priority date as a Continuation-in-Part.

Applicant submits that this rejection is overcome and respectfully requests the rejection is withdrawn.


Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips in view of Harrell and Cockson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,566,225 to Mizoguchi et al.

Applicant is cancelling Claim 14. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments submitted herein and the above comments, it is believed that all grounds of rejection are overcome and that the application has now
5 been placed in full condition for allowance. Should there be any further questions or reservations, Examiner is urged to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney at (330) 253-5678.

Respectfully submitted,


John D. Gagliotta, P.E., Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,538
430 White Pond Drive
Suite 200
Akron, OH 44320
(330) 253-5678
Facsimile (330) 253-6658